

Serial No.: 10/722,167
Docket No.: 101-R001
Amendment dated August 8, 2006
Reply to the Office Action of June 7, 2006

REMARKS

Introduction

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 22-24 and 28 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-31 are pending in the application. Claims 21, 23-25, and 29 have been amended. Claims 22, 27, and 28 have been canceled. Claims 32 and 33 are newly presented. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks and amendments, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 21, 25-27 and 29-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox (USPN 4,561,761) in view of Takahashi (USPN 5,805,954). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The Examiner alleges at page 2 of the Office Action that Fox in view of Takahashi disclose a light guide member spreading and reflecting light toward a photosensitive drum in a scan direction (see Office Action, Page 2, paragraph 3). It is respectfully submitted that Fox in view of Takahashi do not disclose a "light spreading member to spread the light in a scan direction of the photosensitive drum and to focus the light in a direction perpendicular to the scan direction" as currently recited in independent claim 25, or a "light guide member to reflect the light beam" and "to focus the light in a direction perpendicular to the scan direction of the photosensitive drum," as currently recited in independent claim 29. Specifically, the light guide member 70 of Fox (see Fig. 2) does not both spread (or reflect) light in a scanning direction and focus (or collect) light in a direction perpendicular to the scanning direction. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 25 and 29 are allowable over Fox in view of Takahashi, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims is earnestly

Serial No.: 10/722,167
Docket No.: 101-R001
Amendment dated August 8, 2006
Reply to the Office Action of June 7, 2006

solicited.

Furthermore, the Examiner acknowledges that Fox does not disclose a laser scan unit, but then alleges that Takahashi discloses this feature (see Office Action, page 2). However, the Examiner has not pointed out any element in Takahashi which corresponds to the "laser scan unit" alleged to be taught, nor is there any disclosure of a laser scan unit in Takahashi. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Takahashi does not disclose a laser scan unit. While Takahashi refers to "light for exposure" in element 3 of Fig. 3, the figures do not show a laser scan unit and there is no description of light being emitted from a "laser scan unit," as recited in independent claims 21, 25, and 29. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that none of claims 21, 25, and 29 as originally presented can be properly rejected as being obvious in view of Fox in combination with Takahashi. However, in order to help expedite the prosecution, independent claims 21, 25, and 29 have been amended to include features which the Examiner has indicated as allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 21, 25, and 29, along with their corresponding dependent claims 23, 24, 30, and 31, are allowable over Fox in view of Takahashi for these additional reasons, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 22-24 and 28 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims 21 and 25, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 22 has been canceled and the features of claim 22 have been added to independent claim 21. Claim 28 has been canceled and the features of claim 28 and intervening claim 27 have been added to independent claim 25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 21 and 25 are patentable over the prior art of Fox in view of Takahashi, and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 23 and 24 depend from independent claim 21, and therefore contain all of the features recited in independent claim 21, and are therefore also patentable over the prior art of Fox in view of Takahashi. Accordingly, Applicant

Serial No.: 10/722,167
Docket No.: 101-R001
Amendment dated August 8, 2006
Reply to the Office Action of June 7, 2006

respectfully submits that claims 21, 23, 24, and 25 are patentable over Fox in view of Takahashi, and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

New Claims 32 and 33

Claims 32 and 33 have been newly added. New claims 32 and 33 recite similar features as those recited in allowable independent claim 25, which as pointed out above, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in the prior art of record, such as, for example, spreading light in a scan direction of a photosensitive drum and focusing (i.e., collecting) the light from the light emitting element in a direction perpendicular to the scan direction. Applicant respectfully submits that support for newly added claims 32 and 33 can be found, for example, at column 6, lines 37-57 of the original patent. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 32 and 33 do not present new matter, and are allowable over the prior art of record, and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.


Serial No.: 10/722,167
Docket No.: 101-R001
Amendment dated August 8, 2006
Reply to the Office Action of June 7, 2006

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: August 8, 2006
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: 
Patrick J. Stanzone
Registration No. 40,434